



Annual Performance Report

January 2013


APR (FFY 2011): 2011-2012

- Updated copy of the
 - State Performance Plan
 - Annual Progress Report
 - Found on Special Education State Performance Plan website at http://doe.sd.gov/oess/sped_SPP.aspx



The screenshot displays the South Dakota Department of Education website. At the top is a red navigation bar with white text and dropdown arrows for: Accreditation and Certification, Assessment and Technology, Curriculum and CTE, Finance, Grants Data Management, Health, Nutrition After School, and Title Programs SPED, Head Start. Below this, the main content area is divided into three columns. The left column features a 'Calendar of Events' icon and a 'QUICK LINKS' section with a list of links including '2013 Legislature', 'A-Z Index', 'About the Department', 'Accountability/ AYP', 'Board of Education', 'Common Core', 'Content Standards', 'Indian Education', 'Report Card', and 'School Directory'. The middle column is titled 'State Performance Plan' in red, with sub-links 'INDICATORS | LEA PUBLIC REPORTING | CONTACT' and a paragraph explaining that the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) of 2004 requires all states to have a State Performance Plan (SPP) that evaluates the state's efforts to implement IDEA requirements and describes how the state will improve student performance/achievement. The right column is titled 'DOCUMENTS' and lists 'Annual Performance Report', 'Data Collection Calendar', 'Determination Letter', and 'State Performance Plan Overview'.

Accreditation and Certification ▾ Assessment and Technology ▾ Curriculum and CTE ▾ Finance, Grants Data Management ▾ Health, Nutrition After School ▾ Title Programs SPED, Head Start ▾

 **Calendar of Events**

QUICK LINKS
2013 Legislature
A-Z Index
About the Department
Accountability/ AYP
Board of Education
Common Core
Content Standards
Indian Education
Report Card
School Directory

State Performance Plan
INDICATORS | LEA PUBLIC REPORTING | CONTACT

The Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) of 2004 requires all states to have in place a State Performance Plan (SPP) that evaluates the State's efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of IDEA and describes how the State will improve student performance/achievement.(See US Dept. of

DOCUMENTS
Annual Performance Report
Data Collection Calendar
Determination Letter
State Performance Plan Overview

Changes To FFY 2011 APR

- Indicators Eliminated
 - Indicator 16: Written Complaints
 - Indicator 17: Due Process Hearings
 - Both are timelines and already reported
 - Indicator 9 and 10: Disproportionality
 - No longer have underrepresented
- Paperwork Reduction
 - If state met target, no reporting progress or slippage and improvement activities.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma (FFY 2010 data)

80% of youth with Individual Education Plans will graduate from high school with a regular diploma

South Dakota calculates **64.23%** of youth with Individual Education Plans graduated from high school with a regular diploma in **2010-2011**.
Note: New graduation rate calculation

Target was not met by South Dakota
Note: one year lag behind

Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma (FFY 2011 data)

81.5% of youth with Individual Education Plans will graduate from high school with a regular diploma

South Dakota calculates **63.80%** of youth with Individual Education Plans graduated from high school with a regular diploma in **2011-2012**.

Target will not be met by South Dakota in next APR (FFY 2011)
Note: one year lag behind

ESEA Graduation Calculation

Number of cohort members
who earned a regular high
school diploma by the end
of the 2010- 2011
school year

Number of first-time 9th
graders in fall (starting
cohort) plus students who
transfer in, minus
students who transfer out,
emigrate, or die.

535

**1298 – 459 - 6 =
833**

64.23%

Graduation Rate Data Breakdown

- Number who graduated in 4 years
 - 535
- Adjusted Cohort
 - Number started and transferred in subtract transfer out
 - 833
- State Graduation Rate
 - 64.23% in 2010-2011
 - 63.80% in 2011-2012
- 298 Students with Disabilities did not finish in 4 years.

Setting Targets

The 80% target will increase at a rate of 1.5% per year until reaching the state's graduation goal of 85%

- Baseline: 64.23%
- Target will need to follow ESEA.

Indicator 2: Dropout

Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

3.21% of students with disabilities are dropping out of high school.

2010-2011 state data showed that **5990** students with disabilities in grades 7-12 were on child count in South Dakota and **104** students with disabilities dropped out of school during the 2010-2011 school year.. The percentage of high school students with disabilities that dropped out is **1.74%**.

Note: OSEP requires states to follow ESEA (Title) data which lags one year behind. South Dakota decided to utilize same calculations as previous years instead of new measurement. Accepted by OSEP

South Dakota Met target for FFY 11 (utilizing FFY 2010 data)

Indicator 2: Dropout Rate

- 33 districts
- 104 students with disabilities dropout and did not return.
- 5990 number of students with disabilities grades 7 – 12
- $104/5990$
- $.0174 \times 100 = 1.74\%$

Indicator 1 and 2: Improvement Activities

- Dropout Prevention Coordinator
- Conduct dropout prevention webinars
- Dropout prevention website
- Promote self-advocacy curriculum and activities that can be incorporated into elementary, middle school, and high school levels.
- Research district needs and find most effective way to meet those needs.
- Early Interventions: Promote and partner with RTI and PBIS Initiatives

Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment

Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. A.1 or A.2) A.1 AYP percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup)}}{\text{(total \# of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- A.2 AMO percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AMO targets for the disability subgroup)}}{\text{(total \# of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- South Dakota is choosing Option A.2.**
- B. Participation rate percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment)}}{\text{(total \# of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)}} \right]$. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
- C. Proficiency rate percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient)}}{\text{(total \# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)}} \right]$.

Indicators	Reading	Math
A. Districts meeting AYP in disability subgroup	Target: Baseline Actual Data: 9.38%	
B. Participation rate for students with disabilities	Target: 99.3% Actual Data: 99.57%	Target: 99.3% Actual Data: 99.56%
C. Proficiency rate for students with disabilities	Target: Baseline Actual State: 42.40%	Target: Baseline Actual State: 42.17%

Year	Total Number of Districts	Number of Districts Meeting the “n” size	Number of Districts that meet the minimum “n” size and met AYP/AMO for FFY 2011	Percent of Districts
FFY 2011 (11-12)	152	32	3	9.38%

Districts with a disability subgroup that meet the State’s minimum “N” size AND met the State’s AYP/AMO target for the disability subgroup.

To determine if a district/school met the AMO:

- The SEA determines if the LEA met the AMO outlined in the current Accountability workbook at the elementary, middle and high school level.
- If the AMO was met at any level the district is considered to have met the AMO.
 - Safe Harbor calculations as outlined in the Accountability Workbook can also be used in determining if the AMO was met.

Disaggregated Target Data for Math Performance: # and % of students enrolled with IEPs that scored proficient or higher

Statewide Assessment		Math Assessment Performance							Total	
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	#	%
2011-12		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	#	%
A	Total tested Children with IEPs	1606	1477	1286	1197	1063	1018	675	8322	
B	Tested Proficient in regular assessment with no accommodations	486	395	206	171	124	88	42	1512	18.17%
C	Tested Proficient in regular assessment with accommodations	309	293	266	208	140	174	49	1439	17.29%
D	Tested Proficient in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
E	Tested Proficient in alternate assessment against modified standards	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
F	Tested Proficient in alternate assessment against alternate standards	76	68	88	94	101	73	58	558	6.71%
G	Tested Proficient Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	871	756	560	473	365	335	149	3509	42.17%

Disaggregated Target Data for Reading Performance: # and % of students with IEPs that scored proficient or higher

Statewide Assessment 2011-12		Reading Assessment Performance							Total	
		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade HS	#	%
A	Total Tested Children with IEPs	1606	1477	1286	1198	1064	1018	674	8323	
B	Tested Proficient in regular assessment with no accommodations	495	384	222	199	125	112	64	1601	19.24%
C	Tested Proficient in regular assessment with accommodations	267	261	263	224	136	143	60	1354	16.27%
D	Tested Proficient in alternate assessment against grade-level standards	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
E	Tested Proficient in alternate assessment against modified standards	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
F	Tested Proficient in alternate assessment against alternate standards	77	74	90	103	103	74	53	574	6.90%
G	Tested Proficient Overall (b+c+d+e+f) Baseline	839	719	575	526	364	329	177	3529	42.40%

Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment

- Activities:
 - PD on aligning instruction
 - Analyze state assessment data
 - Information on Accommodations
 - Implementing Standard Based IEPS
 - Follow Up Accommodation Study

Indicator 4: Suspension/Expulsion

Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and

A) 1.30% of districts with suspension rates > 5% of their students with disabilities population

FFY 2010 data reported in FFY 2011:

0%

South Dakota Met Target

B. (a) Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

2010: 0.0%

South Dakota Met Target

Indicator 4: Improvement Activities

- Conduct Professional Development in area of PBIS
- Behavior Workshops
- TA on PBIS and RTI

Indicator 5: LRE Placement

Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. inside the regular class 80% or more of the day inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

A.	66%	inside the regular class more than 80% of the day	inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.
B.	6.0%			
C.	3.8%			
		10334 students inside the regular class 80% or more of the day divided by 15279 students ages 6-21 X 100 = 67.64%.	794 students inside the regular class less than 40% of the day divided by 15279 students ages 6-21 X 100 = 5.20%.	457 students in outside placements divided by 15279 students ages 6-21 X 100 = 2.99%

Targets was met by South Dakota

Indicator 5 Improvement

- Conduct training workshops for general and special education personnel
- Provide training for SPED teachers
- Evaluate training of general and special education personnel and staff

Indicator 6: Preschool Settings

Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

FFY 2011: SEP set baseline, targets, and activities

Included in State Performance Plan and not in APR for FFY 2011

Special Education Placement Data – Ages 3-5		
School Age (ages 3-5) Settings		
	2011-2012	
Regular Early Childhood Program – Special Education services in the EC program	571	20.94%
Regular Early Childhood Program – majority of special education services in another location	1546	56.71%
Separate Special Education Classroom	430	15.77%
Separate School	24	.01%
Residential Facility	3	.00%
Home	32	.01%
Provider Location or Other Location	120	.04%
Total # of children	2726	

Baseline Data for FFY 2011 (2011-2012):

A. Number of children aged 3 through 5 attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education services in the early childhood program:

$$571/2726 * 100 = 20.94\%$$

B. Number of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility.

$$457/2726 * 100 = 16.76\%$$

Indicator 6 Targets

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011 (2011-2012)	South Dakota will maintain the percentage of preschool children with IEPs who receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers at 20.94% (a) and maintain the number of students receiving services outside the regular early childhood preschool program at 16.76% (b).
2012 (2012-2013)	South Dakota will increase the percentage of preschool children with IEPs who receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers to 21.45% (a) and decrease the number of students receiving special education services outside the regular early childhood preschool program to 16.26% (b).

Indicator 6

Improvement Activities

Activities	Timeline	Resources
SEP will provide technical assistance and/or training/professional development to general education, special education professionals and collaborate with Part C to improve district systems and preschool least restrictive environments data quality at a minimum of 2 times per reporting year.	July 2012 – June 2014	Special Education Programs, Office of Finance and Management, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), and Part C Birth to 3 Connections Staff

Indicator 7: Preschool Skills Outcomes

Display 7-1: Targets and Actual Data for Preschool Children Exiting in FFY 2011 (2011-12)

	Positive Social-Emotional Skills		Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills		Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.	78.65%	71.43%	64.49%	70.02%	66.60%	65.11%
2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited.	84.10%	82.18%	55.46%	56.22%	71.60%	69.89%

Two of the six targets were met.

Display 7-2: Number and Percentage of Children in Each Progress Category and Summary Statement Calculations For Preschool Children Exiting in FFY 2011 (2011-12)

	Positive Social-Emotional Skills		Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills		Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs	
	# of children	% of children	# of children	% of children	# of children	% of children
a - Children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
b - Children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers	68	10.45%	137	21.04%	112	17.20%
c - Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	48	7.37%	148	22.73%	84	12.90%
d - Children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	122	18.74%	172	26.42%	125	19.20%
e - Children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	413	63.44%	194	29.80%	330	50.69%
Total	651	100.00%	651	100.00%	651	100.00%
Summary Statements:						
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.		71.43%		70.02%		65.11%
2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited.		82.18%		56.22%		69.89%

Display 7-3: Summary Statement Results Over Time

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Number of Children:	525	520	500	651
Positive Social-Emotional Skills				
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.	78.05%	79.78%	73.65%	71.43%
2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited.	84.00%	84.04%	86.80%	82.18%
Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills				
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.	69.41%	64.29%	69.79%	70.02%
2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited.	54.86%	57.31%	61.80%	56.22%
Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs				
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.	71.16%	66.40%	68.00%	65.11%
2. Percent of children who were functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited.	71.05%	72.12%	73.60%	69.89%



Indicator 7 Activities

- SEP will provide technical assistance, training, professional development to general education, special education professionals and collaborate with Part C to improve district systems, preschool outcomes and data quality at a minimum of 2 times per reporting year
- SEP will provide technical assistance, training, professional development to early childhood professionals within the areas of early literacy development and implementation to improve preschool outcomes at a minimum of 2 times per reporting year

Indicator 8: Parent Involvement

Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

67.2% of parents with a child receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

	FFY2011
Total number of parents who responded	4,401
Number of parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement	3,767
Percentage	85.6%

Target was met by South Dakota

Indicator 8: Trend

	FFY2007	FFY2008	FFY2009	FFY2010	FFY2011
Total number of Parent respondents	2,716	3,093	3,518	3,968	4,401
# who reported school facilitated their involvement	2,151	2,524	2,962	3,353	3,767
% who reported school facilitated their involvement	79.2%	81.6%	84.2%	84.5%	85.6%



Indicator 8: Activities

- Recognize the Response Rate of 50% or more
- Low Rate Response follow-up

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation in Special Education

Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that are the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%

	Under-representation	Over-representation
Total # of LEAs	152	152
# of LEAs flagged for numerical disproportionate representation	0	0
% of LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation	0.0%	.0%
# of LEAs found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0	0
Percent of LEAs that had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0.0%	0.0%

The target of 0% was met.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.			
The percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as the result of inappropriate identification will be 0%		Under-representation	Over-representation
	Total # of LEAs	152	152
	# of LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation	0	0
	% of LEAs flagged for potential disproportionate representation	0.0%	0.0%
	# of LEAs found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0	0
	Percent of LEAs that had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification	0.0%	0.0%
The target of 0% was met.			

Indicator 11: Child Find

Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within State established timeline of 25 school days.

100 % of children with parental consent for initial evaluation, will be evaluated within 25 school days

Of the 4627 students who received a sign consent for evaluation,

- 4613 children whose evaluation were completed within 25 school days
 - 916 were determined not eligible
 - 3697 were found eligible
 - 14 students evaluations were outside the timeline in 5 districts

This gave South Dakota a percentage of evaluation conducted with the timeline at **99.7%**

Target was not Met

Indicator 11: Activities

- SEP will provide training and technical assistance on meeting evaluation timelines for districts based on their annual indicator report, at a minimum of two times per year in order to maintain a high compliance rate in meeting initial evaluation timelines.

Indicator 12: Part C to B Transition

Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.

$$\text{Percent} = [(c) / (a-b-d-e)] * 100$$

- a. Of the 652 children referred from Part C to Part B,
- b. 184 were not eligible for Part B
- c. 408 were eligible for Part B
- d. 0 # of parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in initial evaluation or initial services
- e. 60 were referred less than 90 days prior to 3rd birthday

This gave South Dakota a **100%** students referred from part C to part B prior to the 3rd Birthday.

Target was met

Activities: SEP will provide technical assistance and training to Part B and Part C staff in order to increase reliable and valid data collected which will improve meeting transition timelines between Part C, families and school districts to part B service and meeting timeline for student's having an IEP in place by their 3rd birthday.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition with IEP Goals

Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

100% of students 16 years and older will have a coordinated set of activities.

354 Files were submitted

343 Files were correct

11 Files were corrected

96.89% Compliance

South Dakota did not meet target of 100% but improved from last year

Indicator 13 Activities

- Transition Institute
- Training on Indicator 13 checklist
- Increase use of TSLP website
- Increase knowledge of Adult Agencies.
- New:
 - Self-Advocacy at elementary, middle, and high school.
 - Collaborate with Career and Technical Education office around career awareness activities.

Indicator 14: Secondary Transition/Post-School Outcomes

Indicator 14– *Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) in effect at the time they left school, and were:*

- A. *Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.*
- B. *Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.*
- C. *Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. (technical institutes)*

- A. *Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.*

A = 35/339 (total respondents) = 10.32%

- B. *Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.*

B = 35 + 180/339 (total respondents) = 63.42%

- C. *Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.*

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

C = 35+180+20+25/339(total respondents) = 76.7%

A: Target 15.00%: Not Met

B: Target 66.25%: Not Met

C: Target 81%: Not Met

Indicator 14 Activities

- Transition Community of Practice
- Collaborate with Career and Technical Education
- Self-Advocacy embedded in curriculum
- Collect data, research strategies, and increase enrollment and completion in higher education
-

Indicator 15: Monitoring, Complaints, and Hearings

General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

100% of noncompliance completed within one year

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

a. # of findings of noncompliance. 179

b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. 179

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

179/179= 1

1 X 100 = 100%

Target was met by South Dakota.

Explain any progress or slippage

Monitoring visits

- South Dakota Special Education Programs completed onsite compliance monitoring on 48 districts in 2010-2011. Of those 48 districts monitored, 38 districts were issued a total of 149 findings of noncompliance.

Findings

- In addition, four districts were issued eight findings of noncompliance for state complaints. Nine districts were issued fourteen finding of noncompliance for Indicator 13. Four districts were issued findings of noncompliance for Indicator 11. The districts were issued a Corrective Action Plan and completed.

Verification

- The State has verified that each child specific incidence of noncompliance was corrected (prong 1). In addition to verifying the child specific noncompliance, the State reviewed subsequent data to determine if the districts have properly implemented the requirements (prong 2) as required in the 09-02 memo, therefore, verifying the correction of noncompliance. South Dakota has verified that all but one district is currently correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.



Indicator 15: Activities

- Provide technical assistance via webinars, IEP and Indicator 13 training workshops along with on-site visits

Indicator 16: Written Complaints

Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

100% of signed written complaints will be investigated and have reports issued within the 60-day timeline, or have documentation of a timeline extension for exceptional circumstances.

OSEP no longer requires Indicator 16: Written Complaints in the APR

Target was met by South Dakota.

Indicator 17: Due Process Hearings

Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

100% of due process hearings will be completed within the 45-day timeline, or have documentation of a timeline extended for exceptional purposes.

OSEP no longer requires Indicator 17: Due Process Hearings

No hearings were held.

Indicator 18: Hearing Requests that went to Resolution

Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

No targets need to be set if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10

(3.1) Resolution sessions: 4
(a) Settlement agreements: 0

4 Resolution Sessions Were Held

Indicator 19: Mediations

Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.	
No target necessary when state has less than 10 mediations	SECTION B: Mediation requests (2) Mediation requests total: 4 (2.1) Mediations <i>[held]</i> : 4 (a) Mediations <i>[held]</i> related to due process: 1 (i) Mediation agreements: 0 (b) Mediations <i>[held]</i> not related to due process: 3 (i) Mediation agreements: 3 (2.2) Mediations not held (including pending): 0 (2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held: 0
< 10 Mediations held	

Indicator 20: Timelines

State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

100% of required data reports will be accurate and 100 % will be submitted on time.

Part A: Timely submissions – Target was met by South Dakota.

Part B: Accuracy of data - Target was met by South Dakota.

OSEP is filling out the rubric for us. We believe it will be at 100%



Special Education Programs

<http://doe.sd.gov/oess/sped.aspx>

605-773-3678